

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

RW DBA RHM,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE PARTNERSHIPS AND
UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATIONS
IDENTIFIED IN SCHEDULE “A”,

Defendants.

Case No. 24-cv-01289

Judge John Robert Blakey
Magistrate Judge Young B. Kim

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO EXTEND
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER**

Plaintiff, RW DBA RHM (“Plaintiff”), respectfully requests extension of the Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”) [15], currently in force in this matter pursuant to the Court’s discretion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(2). In support of the motion, Plaintiff states:

1. On February 20, 2024, the court granted Plaintiff’s motion for an *ex parte* TRO [14] and entered a sealed TRO [15]. The TRO expires on March 5, 2024.

2. On February 20, 2024, and February 23, 2024, Plaintiff served the sealed order, complaint, and a subpoena on the following e-commerce sites and payment processors via email: Amazon, CJ Dropshipping, DHgate, eBay, Joybuy, Shein, Temu, Walmart, Wish, and PayPal (the “Platforms and Processors”). The TRO and Plaintiff’s email communication requested that the addressed sites: (1) freeze the assets in the accounts of any Defendant identified on Schedule “A” of the Complaint, and (2) provide Plaintiff information regarding the named Defendants, specifically, their email addresses, other contact information, the amounts frozen in each Defendant’s account, and the number of sales of infringing goods.

3. To date, Amazon, CJ Dropshipping, DHgate, Joybuy, and Walmart have responded to the TRO and produced some or all the requested information. As of the filing of this motion, the remaining Platforms have not responded or otherwise produced the requested documents and information.

4. Defendants will be served with the Summons, sealed Complaint, and sealed TRO as Platforms and Processors produce information to the Plaintiff. As Defendants are served, Plaintiff will add their information to ECF. Some Defendants have contacted the Plaintiff to inquire about the case or make settlement offers in response to having their accounts frozen by the Platforms.

5. Until plaintiff has received notice from each of the Platforms that the asset freeze ordered by the Court has taken place and they have provided complete identifying information regarding each Defendant such that Plaintiff can serve them, the same circumstances that necessitated entry of the TRO continue to apply.

6. The Court has the power and discretion to “for good cause, extend the TRO for a like time,” which, in this instance, is an additional fourteen (14) days.

7. Plaintiff submits that good cause exists to extend the TRO to and including March 19, 2024. Plaintiff has not yet received complete information from the Platforms and Processors and therefore has been unable to serve the Summons, Complaint, and TRO upon every Defendant. Once all Defendants who can be reached have been served, Plaintiff will move the Court to enter a preliminary injunction and unseal all documents sealed by the Court’s order [15].

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter an order extending the current TRO for an additional fourteen (14) days, to and including March 19, 2024.

Dated: February 26, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ James E. Judge

Zareefa B. Flener (IL Bar No. 6281397)
James E. Judge (IL Bar No. 6243206)
Patrycia Piaskowski (IL Bar No. 6346239)
Ying Chen (IL Bar No. (IL Bar No. 6346961)
Flener IP Law, LLC
77 West Washington Street, Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 724-8874
litigation@fleneriplaw.com